

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Applicants have carefully reviewed the Application in light of the non-final Office Action mailed on January 30, 2009. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the present application.

CLAIM REJECTIONS - 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 7, 9-25, 28-33, and 41-47 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as allegedly being incomplete for omitting essential structural cooperative relationships of elements. Specifically, the relationship between “destination host” and “network device” is allegedly unclear.

The pending claims have been amended such that the limitation “destination host” is only recited in claims 17 (recited as a “network node”), 36, and 41-45. Thus, this rejection is moot with respect to those claims other than 17, 36, and 41-45.

Claim 17 has been amended to recite that the network node is “disposed in the first network, configured, and known to the network management system,” which, as recited in claim 9 upon which claim 17 depends, is disposed in the second network.

Claim 36 has been amended to recite that the configuration message “is transmitted from a first network to a second network by a network management system disposed in the first network and directed at a configured destination host having a network address disposed in the second network.”

Claim 41 has been amended to recite that the destination host “is configured and accessible to the resources on at least the second network” and the network device “is unconfigured and inaccessible to the resources on least the second network.”

The network device is initially unconfigured and is disposed on a communication path between a first network and a second network. While the network device operates in an unconfigured mode, it does not have an IP address. Consequently, a device on the first network, e.g., the network management system, is unable to directly transmit a configuration message to the *unconfigured* network device *due to its lacking an IP address known to the network management system*. To solve the problem, the network management system on the first network transmits the configuration message *meant for the network device to another configured* device, e.g., the destination host, on the second network. Since the destination host is already

configured, it has an IP address known to the network management system and the network management system can directly transmit the configuration message to the destination host.

The network device, being disposed on a communication path between the first network and the second network, may then *intercepts* the configuration message meant for it and use the information contained in the configuration message to automatically configure itself. Thus, the destination host provides an *alternative useable* destination for transmitting to the configuration message.

The relationship between the network device and the destination host is explained in more detail in paragraph [0016] of the present specification.

CLAIM REJECTIONS - 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 48-49, 54-55, and 57-58 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Rao (US Pub. 2004/0264395; hereinafter “Rao”) in view of Aboba et al. (US Pub. 2005/0286722; hereinafter “Aboba”).

Claims 1-2, 4-5, 7, 24-25, 28, 34-36, and 38 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Rao in view of Philippou et al (US Pat. 6,385,648; hereinafter “Philippou”) and Hershey et al. (US Pat. 5,481,539; hereinafter “Hershey”).

Claims 9-12 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Rao in view of Philippou.

Claims 51-53 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Rao and Aboba in view of Nomura et al. (US Pat. 6,930,984; hereinafter “Nomura”).

Claims 30 and 32 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Rao, Philippou, and Hershey and further in view of Nomura.

Claims 41-47 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Rao in view of Nomura.

Claims 13-23 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Rao, Philippou, and Nomura and further in view of Ylonen et al. (US Pub. 2002/0191584; hereinafter “Ylonen”).

Claims 29 and 33 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Rao, Philippou, Hershey, and Nomura and further in view of Ylonen.

Claim 31 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Rao, Philippou, Hershey, and Nomura and further in view of Traversat et al. (US Pub. 2007/0097885; hereinafter “Traversat”).

Claims 50 and 56 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Rao and Aboba in view of Ylonen.

The pending claims have been amended to further clarify the distinction between the present application and the cited references. As amended, the above cited references do not disclose all the limitations recited in the independent claims 1, 9, 24, 34, 36, 41, and 48.

With respect to independent claims 1 and 24, the above cited references do not disclose at least the limitation that upon detecting a message transmitted from a first network to a second network at an unconfigured network device, determine whether the message is a configuration message based on whether the message is a null service type RSVP message.

Support for claim amendments may be found, for example, in paragraphs [0024]-[0026] of the present specification.

Rao, in paragraph [0033], discloses that upon detection of a predetermined message by wireless network client 2, the wireless network client 2 configures to access wireless access point 4. However, Rao does not disclose that the wireless network client 2 validates the predetermined message first.

Philippou, in column 5, discloses that box 5, after receiving the service announcement message, replies with an acknowledgement message (lines 10-11) or updates its data values (lines 57-60). However, Philippou does not disclose that box 5 validates the announcement message.

Hershey, in column 2, discloses that the mobile unit compares the mobile unit ID of valid message packets with its own internal ID in order to validate the message packets. Hershey discloses validating *configuration message* intended for configuring the mobile unit. Furthermore, the mobile unit is configured, not unconfigured.

With respect to independent claims 24, 34, and 36, the above cited references do not disclose at least the limitations that upon receiving a configuration message transmitted from a

first network to a second network at an unconfigured network device, validate the configuration message.

Support for claim amendments may be found, for example, in paragraph [0029] of the present specification.

With respect to independent claims 1, 9, 24, and 34, the above cited references do not disclose at least the limitations that (1) the configuration message is a null service type RSVP message; and (2) the unconfigured network device is a null-service-enabled device.

Support for claim amendments may be found, for example, in paragraphs [0024] and [0026] of the present specification. As explained in the present specification, the null-service-enabled network nodes interpret null service type messages as requesting no specific service type or quantifiable resource. However, an unconfigured network device, when intercepting a null service type message, may determine whether the message is a valid configuration message, and if so, use the configuration information included in the message to automatically configure itself.

Neither Rao nor Philippou discloses using a null service type RSVP message as the initial configuration message and the unconfigured network device is a null-service-enabled device.

With respect to independent claim 36, the above cited references do not disclose at least the limitation of a configuration message transmitted from a first network to a second network by a network management system disposed in the first network and directed at a configured destination host having a network address disposed in the second network.

With respect to independent claim 41, the above cited references do not disclose at least the limitations of (1) a destination host on a first network that is configured and accessible to the resources on a second network; and (2) the configuration message is transmitted from the second network to the destination host and used for automatically configuring an configured network device.

Support for claim amendments may be found, for example, in paragraphs [0016] and [0022] of the present specification.

As explained above in connection with the rejections under 35 U.S.C. 112, because the network device is unconfigured, the configuration message cannot be directly transmitted to the unconfigured network device due to its lacking of an IP address. Instead, the configuration

message is transmitted to an alternative destination, i.e., the destination host, which is configured and has an IP address. The unconfigured network device may then intercepts the configuration message as it is transmitted across from the second network to the first network as the destination host is on the first network.

Rao, in paragraph [0033], discloses that the predetermined message is repeatedly *broadcast* over the local wireless networks. The predetermined message enables the unconfigured network client 2 to access a wireless access point 4 in order to configure itself. However, Rao does not disclose that the predetermined message is *directly* transmitted from a second network to a *specific destination host* on a first network.

With respect to independent claim 48, the above cited references do not disclose at least the limitation of providing a hardware profile that describes *a hardware architecture and an operating system* of an unconfigured network device.

Support for claim amendments may be found, for example, in paragraph [0036] of the present specification.

Rao, in paragraph [0048], discloses that the configuration announcement message from the wireless network client 2 includes an address of the wireless network client 2. However, Rao does not disclose that the configuration announcement message includes the hardware architecture and operating system of the wireless network client 2.

The pending dependent directly or indirectly depend from claims 1, 9, 24, 34, 36, 41, and 48 respectively and are therefore respectfully submitted to be patentable over the above references cited in the outstanding office action for at least the reasons set forth above with respect to the independent claims. Further, these dependent claims recite additional limitations that when considered in the context of the claimed invention further patentably distinguish above references.


CONCLUSION

In light of the foregoing, Applicants believe that all currently pending claims are presently in condition for allowance. Applicants respectfully request a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fee and credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-0384 of Baker Botts LLP.

If a telephone conference would advance prosecution of this Application, the Examiner may call Bernadette Lee, Attorney for Applicant, at 650-739-7506.

Respectfully submitted,
BAKER BOTTS L.L.P.
Attorneys for Applicant

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "Bernadette Lee".

Bernadette Lee
Reg. No. 60,298

Date: February 11, 2009

Correspondence Address: Customer Number: **05073**